```
Page 1
 1
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
     EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
     ATLANTIS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, GmbH,,
                      Plaintiff,
 7
               - against -
                              Docket No. 06-CV-3921
                                                (ADS-WDW)
 8
     CA, INC.,
 9
10
                      Defendant.
      ----X
11
12
               DEPOSITION OF JOHN DUECKMAN, taken by
13
     Plaintiff, pursuant to Notice, at the offices of
     Farrell Fritz, PC, 1320 Reckson Plaza, Uniondale,
15
     New York, on Tuesday, July 29, 2008, commencing at
16
     9:38 a.m., before Chandra D. Brown, a Registered
17
     Professional Reporter and Notary Public within and
18
     for the State of New York.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Page 46 Page 47 J. Dueckman J. Dueckman 2 software for development purposes only. 2 a different machine would be a purpose other than a 3 Because E/NAT was based on that, it restricted 3 development purpose? or precluded our ability to demonstrate that. 4 4 A Correct. 5 Software AG says you can that environment, you 5 MR. McENTEE: Well, it's not running on a 6 can have that software, but for development 6 different machine. It's not a different machine. It's a CA machine. You just can't 7 purposes, because it competes with CA products. 7 8 BY MR. KING: 8 demonstrate it. That's the point. 9 Q So restrictions in your arrangement with 9 Q You can use the software solely for 10 software AG, which owns NATURAL, would preclude you 10 purposes of development, but you can't demonstrate 11 from demo'ing it in a certain -it even if it's on a CA machine? A On CA machines. 12 12 A Correct. As I understand. 13 MR. McENTEE: That was the restriction he 13 0 Did E/NAT have the same restriction; do 14 was referring to. 14 vou know? 1.5 MR. KING: I understand. 15 A E/NAT was based on the software AG 16 Q That's consistent with what you said 16 environment. So it carried with it the restriction. 17 before. 17 MR. McENTEE: Do you know that for a fact. That's because software would be licensed THE WITNESS: That's it's based on the 18 18 19 for use on designated machines? 19 software --20 MR. McENTEE: No. It's for the purpose --20 MR. McENTEE: No. No. No. 21 internal development purposes, not --21 There's restrictions on whether it could MR. KING: Let me get the witness' 22 22 be demo'ed or not. 23 testimony. 23 Q I understood that you were saying that A For development purposes. 24 2.4 E/NAT couldn't be shown without also running a copy 2.5 Q Instead of running it on a different -- on of NATURAL. So whatever --TSG Reporting - Worldwide (877) 702-9580 TSG Reporting - Worldwide (877) 702-9580 Page 48 Page 49 1 J. Dueckman 1 J. Dueckman 2 2 That is correct. a company. So an example would be I used to work at 3 a site called BC Tel. I used to work at a site 3 Q However NATURAL was restricted a the 4 called Canadian Airlines or Canadian Pacific 4 logistical, practical matter, restricted how you 5 5 could use E/NAT? Airlines. 6 6 A That is correct. Q So you're not using site to mean 7 7 geographic location? Q You weren't saying you knew that E/NAT 8 8 actually had a contractual restriction that You could have, for example, a company 9 that has remote geographic locations. Would each of 9 prevented it from being run on those machines, 10 correct? 10 those locations be a site within the meaning of your 11 definition? 11 A That is correct. 12 Q Can you tell me in general terms what the 12 A My definition of a site in the context of 13 what I was just talking about was an instance of 13 **ENDEVOR program does?** that, but there would be nothing to preclude a 14 A ENDEVOR product is categorized as a 14 1.5 software-changing configuration management software. 15 company from having multiple sites. The product allows a site to create processes, 16 Multiple geographic sites? Q controls around the development of software for the 17 17 Typically, yes. O Could you have multiple sites at one 18 main frame and then the promotion through what are 18 19 referred to as life cycle stages, ultimately running 19 geographic location within a company? 20 MR. McENTEE: I'm not sure if it's within 20 into a production environment. 21 21 Q The first part of your answer you said the 30(b)(6). that it's a changing configuration management 22 Are you asking his personal opinion or his 22 23 software that allows a site to do certain things. 23 official position? What do you mean by "a site"? 24 24 That's not a topic he's been designated 25 25 A My definition of a site would be typically TSG Reporting - Worldwide (877) 702-9580 TSG Reporting - Worldwide (877) 702-9580

Page 50 Page 51 1 J. Dueckman 1 J. Dueckman 2 2 MR. KING: I'm asking what the word means. ignorance about software. I'm going to try to 3 MR. McENTEE: He's designated on specific 3 paraphrase what you said. You tell me if I'm 4 topics. Okay. If you're asking him just what 4 accurate. 5 5 his personal understanding is, that's one ENDEVOR essentially helps track changes or thing. If you're asking what CA's official 6 6 milestones or events in the software development 7 position is, that's another issue. 7 process and keeps track of those events. 8 MR. KING: If I'm asking him a question 8 Is that accurate? 9 that you contend falls outside the 30(b)(6) 9 MR. McENTEE: Among other things. 10 designation, then I understand that he has --10 11 he is not -- you haven't designated him to 11 MR. KING: You got to let him answer 12 speak on CA's behalf on that issue. I'm asking 12 though. If you're going to assert an objection 13 13 it's okay. This sort of narrative objection is for his understanding. MR. McENTEE: His personal understanding? 14 14 a little bit obstructive. 15 MR. KING: Yes. 15 MR. McENTEE: He gave you a long list of MR. McENTEE: That's fine. 16 things. You are narrowing it to one thing. 16 BY MR. KING: 17 17 MR. KING: Then I think your appropriate 18 response is objection, but --18 Q Do you remember what the question is at 19 MR. McENTEE: We could be here all day 19 this point? 20 20 with that. I think that was appropriate. A Yes. MR. KING: Okay. 21 My definition is typically a geographic 21 site or -- sorry -- a geographic location is a site. 22 BY MR. KING: 22 That's generally how I treat it. 23 23 Q Is that one of its key functions, what 24 Q Okay. 24 I've just described? 25 Once again, I'll ask you to indulge my 25 A Yes. TSG Reporting - Worldwide (877) 702-9580 TSG Reporting - Worldwide (877) 702-9580 Page 52 Page 53 1 J. Dueckman 1 J. Dueckman 2 2 from one life cycle state to the next life cycle Q Okay. 3 3 Are there other key functions that I am 4 4 Q Why is it important to track those 5 5 A Is it possible to get a readback of your changes? 6 6 paraphrase? Why does anyone care about that sort of 7 7 Q Sure. historical data? 8 8 A There are a variety of reasons from (Whereupon the requested question was read 9 9 back by the Court Reporter.) auditing to make sure that a developer either 10 Q I believe you testified that, yes, that's 10 knowingly or unknowingly has only made changes to accurate. Is there another primary general function software that have been approved or that have been 11 11 12 of ENDEVOR that I'm missing in that description. 12 authorized. 13 13 I'm just trying to understand what the product does? In a similar vein, a subsequent developer 14 A At a very high level definition, that is may need to understand and see what changes took 14 15 15 accurate in terms of encompassing. place to the software in order to put a possible 16 problem into context or for that matter additional Q Okay. 17 That's squares with my understanding of a 17 changes that they may need to make. So that 18 historical auditing type of information is really change manager. 19 Is there a difference between a change 19 also crucial for assurance of adherence to 20 20 manager and a configuration manager? regulatory requirements especially with financial 21 21 A The configuration aspect in the definition systems. that you proposed, that you paraphrased, would be 22 Q ENDEVOR is designed to run on main frame 23 the piece that talks about its ability to track the 23 computers, correct? changes, what changes took place and the ultimate 24 A That is correct. making or building or even deploying of a software 25 Q In what operating system does it run in? TSG Reporting - Worldwide (877) 702-9580 TSG Reporting - Worldwide (877) 702-9580

Page 74 Page 75 J. Dueckman J. Dueckman 2 2 Q Am I correct that if you had a customer AllFusion/ENDEVOR change manager. At the bottom it 3 3 that was using NATURAL as its programming tool, you bears a copyright notice indicating that this is a 4 wanted to sell that customer your ENDEVOR product, document from 2002. 5 5 one of the aspects of the package that you could Do you recognize this document? 6 A (Witness views document.) promote to them was that we have an interface that 7 will permit you to enjoy all the benefits of ENDEVOR 7 Yes. 8 while using NATURAL? 8 Q Can you tell me what it is? 9 9 A It's a document that outlines the Is that a fair description? 10 10 different options that was available to the 11 MR. McENTEE: Objection to form. 11 ENDEVOR-based product. 12 MR. KING: This will be 113. 12 Q Is this a document that was used to train 13 (Whereupon, the aforementioned document 13 salespeople or was this actually given to customers? 14 14 Bates stamped CA53166 and 67, was marked as A Likely both. 15 15 Plaintiff's Exhibit 113 for identification as 0 Okav. of this date by the reporter.) 16 This document is a summary of some of the 16 17 MR. KING: Off the record. 17 options that are available in connection with 18 (Whereupon, an off-the-record discussion 18 ENDEVOR? 19 19 A Correct. was held.) 20 20 MR. KING: Back on the record. O If you turn to the second page of the BY MR. KING: 21 document, the first entry states AllFusion/ENDEVOR 21 22 Q Mr. Dueckman, we are placing in front of 22 change manager interface for NATURAL. 23 23 you what we've marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 113. Is that a long way of designating the 24 It's a two-page document bearing Bates numbers 24 E/NAT product? A Yes. CA53166 and 67. You'll see at the top it says 25 TSG Reporting - Worldwide (877) 702-9580 TSG Reporting - Worldwide (877) 702-9580 Page 77 Page 76 1 J. Dueckman 1 J. Dueckman 2 Q Okay. 2 Q So E/NAT was one of the various attributes 3 3 The description of what that particular of the ENDEVOR product line that you would promote E/NAT product does states AllFusion/ENDEVOR CM 4 4 to customers, correct? 5 5 interface -- and I assume CM means change manager? MR. McENTEE: Objection to "attribute". 6 6 MR. KING: It's probably a poor choice of 7 7 Q -- for NATURAL is an option to word 8 AllFusion/ENDEVOR CM than enables management of the 8 Q E/NAT was one of the ENDEVOR options that 9 software development process for software AG's you would promote to customers for purposes of 10 NATURAL and software AG's Predict. It allows 10 soliciting their business, correct? development organizations utilizing NATURAL as their 11 11 A Assuming they had a need for the NATURAL 12 development tool to enjoy all of the life cycle 12 piece, yes. Not every customer that we approach had management features of AllFusion/ENDEVOR CM. 13 NATURAL or that we do approach has NATURAL. 13 14 14 Is that an accurate description of what Q For those customers who did have NATURAL, 15 15 E/NAT does? It basically lets a company using E/NAT would be a critical component, correct? 16 NATURAL take advantage of all the features of 16 MR. McENTEE: Objection. 17 ENDEVOR as a change manager? 17 I'm not sure I know what your client 18 A Yes. 18 thinks is critical. 19 Q So in this document, you were promoting, 19 A Once the salesperson had qualified that 20 20 to the extent that this was given to customers, you they had NATURAL, we would ensure that customer was 21 were promoting to customers that if you're using 21 aware that we have an interface that runs in a NATURAL, we have a great interface that will permit NATURAL environment. So how critical it was for 22 23 you to use ENDEVOR and take advantage of all of its 23 them to address that environment would be their 24 benefits; is that correct? call. 24 25 A Yes. 25 Q Well, put it this way: A customer wanting TSG Reporting - Worldwide (877) 702-9580 TSG Reporting - Worldwide (877) 702-9580

```
Page 1
1
2
                UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3
      ATLANTIS INFORMATION ) Docket No.
      TECHNOLOGY, GmbH,
                                   ) 06-CV-3921
5
                                   ) (ADS-WDW)
                Plaintiff,
б
                vs.
7
      CA, INC.,
8
                Defendant.
10
11
12
                DEPOSITION OF JOHN R. DUECKMAN
13
                       New York, New York
14
                 Thursday, December 17, 2009
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
    Reported by:
    PENNY SHERMAN
25
    JOB NO. 26783
```

	Page 30		Page 31
1	Dueckman	1	Dueckman
2	reflection or a reporting what Endeavor is storing	2	Q. And does Endeavor require the same kind
3	up in the natural environment.	3	of interface in order to operate with programming
4	Q. Well, if I understand this correctly,	4	that's being done in these third-generation
5	the purpose of Endeavor is that it's a change	5	languages?
6	manager, and it keeps track of these changes that	6	Do you need to have a special interface
7	are made in the development world, whatever that	7	for Endeavor to operate and keep track of the
8	world is; is that a fair statement?	8	changes that are being done in that development
9	A. That's its prime function, yes.	9	environment?
10	Q. So it would do that for regardless of	10	A. You'd have to define what you mean by
11	whether you were programming in the natural	11	development environment.
12	language or you were programming in Cobol or some	12	Q. Well, do you have to have a special
13	other language, correct?	13	interface in order for Endeavor to work with other
14	A. Correct.	14	programming languages in order to keep track of
15	Q. All right. Now, do you understand that	15	changes and perform the Endeavor changes?
16	natural is sometimes referred to as a fourth	16	A. It depends. It depends on where the
17	generation language	17	developer is doing his work.
18	A. Yes.	18	Q. Well, can you identify any other special
19	Q do you know what that means?	19	interfaces, like E/Net, that have been developed
20	And that there are third-generation	20	for Endeavor to enable Endeavor to operate with
21	programming languages?	21	other, you know, programming language environments?
22	A. Yes.	22	A. Certainly. One that comes to mind is
23	Q. For example, Cobol is a third-generation	23	Roscoe. It's a developer's environment.
24	programming language?	24	Q. And there's a special interface that was
25	A. Yes.	25	created for that?
	TSG Reporting - Worldwide 877-702-9580		TSG Reporting - Worldwide 877-702-9580
	Daga 22		
	Page 32		Page 33
1	Dueckman	1	Page 33 Dueckman
1 2		1 2	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm
	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others?		Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of
2	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns?	2	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor.
2	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses	2 3 4 5	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of
2 3 4 5 6	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah.	2 3 4	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for
2 3 4 5 6 7	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part of a CA product for our I think it's our IEMS
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that correct? A. No. It provides the capability of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part of a CA product for our I think it's our IEMS database product.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that correct? A. No. It provides the capability of interfacing to Endeavor so a developer can download	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part of a CA product for our I think it's our IEMS database product. Q. That's an interface for this particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that correct? A. No. It provides the capability of interfacing to Endeavor so a developer can download onto their notebook or onto a PC, do their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part of a CA product for our I think it's our IEMS database product. Q. That's an interface for this particular database?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that correct? A. No. It provides the capability of interfacing to Endeavor so a developer can download onto their notebook or onto a PC, do their development there, and then upload there. So it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part of a CA product for our I think it's our IEMS database product. Q. That's an interface for this particular database? A. Correct. But I'm not familiar with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that correct? A. No. It provides the capability of interfacing to Endeavor so a developer can download onto their notebook or onto a PC, do their development there, and then upload there. So it provides an interface to disparate platforms.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part of a CA product for our I think it's our IEMS database product. Q. That's an interface for this particular database? A. Correct. But I'm not familiar with the technical details of it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that correct? A. No. It provides the capability of interfacing to Endeavor so a developer can download onto their notebook or onto a PC, do their development there, and then upload there. So it provides an interface to disparate platforms. Q. No, I'm talking about an interface	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part of a CA product for our I think it's our IEMS database product. Q. That's an interface for this particular database? A. Correct. But I'm not familiar with the technical details of it. Q. Do all these interfaces operate through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that correct? A. No. It provides the capability of interfacing to Endeavor so a developer can download onto their notebook or onto a PC, do their development there, and then upload there. So it provides an interface to disparate platforms. Q. No, I'm talking about an interface that's necessary in order for it to be able to, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part of a CA product for our I think it's our IEMS database product. Q. That's an interface for this particular database? A. Correct. But I'm not familiar with the technical details of it. Q. Do all these interfaces operate through the Endeavor API interface?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that correct? A. No. It provides the capability of interfacing to Endeavor so a developer can download onto their notebook or onto a PC, do their development there, and then upload there. So it provides an interface to disparate platforms. Q. No, I'm talking about an interface that's necessary in order for it to be able to, you know, interact with a particular programming	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part of a CA product for our I think it's our IEMS database product. Q. That's an interface for this particular database? A. Correct. But I'm not familiar with the technical details of it. Q. Do all these interfaces operate through the Endeavor API interface? A. Which ones did I say?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that correct? A. No. It provides the capability of interfacing to Endeavor so a developer can download onto their notebook or onto a PC, do their development there, and then upload there. So it provides an interface to disparate platforms. Q. No, I'm talking about an interface that's necessary in order for it to be able to, you know, interact with a particular programming language, like natural.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part of a CA product for our I think it's our IEMS database product. Q. That's an interface for this particular database? A. Correct. But I'm not familiar with the technical details of it. Q. Do all these interfaces operate through the Endeavor API interface? A. Which ones did I say? Q. You mentioned Roscoe.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that correct? A. No. It provides the capability of interfacing to Endeavor so a developer can download onto their notebook or onto a PC, do their development there, and then upload there. So it provides an interface to disparate platforms. Q. No, I'm talking about an interface that's necessary in order for it to be able to, you know, interact with a particular programming language, like natural. MR. SCHISSEL: Object to the form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part of a CA product for our I think it's our IEMS database product. Q. That's an interface for this particular database? A. Correct. But I'm not familiar with the technical details of it. Q. Do all these interfaces operate through the Endeavor API interface? A. Which ones did I say? Q. You mentioned Roscoe. A. Roscoe, I don't know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Dueckman A. Correct. Q. Any others? A. That CA owns? Q. That either CA owns or licenses A. Yeah. Q from a third party. A. Another interface would be the change manager, Enterprise Workbench, which is Web based. Q. But that's not something that was designed to enable the product to work with a particular programming environment, that's just an interface to get you on to the Web; is that correct? A. No. It provides the capability of interfacing to Endeavor so a developer can download onto their notebook or onto a PC, do their development there, and then upload there. So it provides an interface to disparate platforms. Q. No, I'm talking about an interface that's necessary in order for it to be able to, you know, interact with a particular programming language, like natural.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Dueckman possibly would be a third-party vendor that I'm aware of that has their own proprietary form of developing code that is then delivered to Endeavor. That would be Microfocus. Q. And there's a special interface for that? A. That they developed, that they maintain, yes. Q. Now A. Another one that I can think of, but I'm not familiar with the details of it, is something called Endeavor DB, which is, again, a CA part of a CA product for our I think it's our IEMS database product. Q. That's an interface for this particular database? A. Correct. But I'm not familiar with the technical details of it. Q. Do all these interfaces operate through the Endeavor API interface? A. Which ones did I say? Q. You mentioned Roscoe.

Page 102 Page 103 1 Dueckman 1 Dueckman 2 example, 16, I think, where Endeavor's licensed. 2 But I would like to ask you what, to your 3 3 The group in the United Kingdom was the understanding, what damage has CA sustained as a 4 group that was specifically looking at E/Net when I 4 result of these alleged failures by Atlantis to talked with them personally. And like -- as I 5 5 provide these eight enhancements to E/Net? A. In preparing for this deposition, as 6 indicated, I believe that was in the late-90s. And 6 7 7 next correspondence I saw was them looking again, I well as in the litigation in general, a part of 8 think it was in the year 2003, but it was 8 what I've been made aware of was the fact that the 9 correspondence with Steve Cannon that we've 9 development of E/Net Version 3, for all intents and 10 referred to earlier, as well. 10 purposes, ceased entirely in the years 2002 and 11 Q. So, is it your belief, then, that that 11 12 issue with JPMorgan Chase in the UK is unrelated to 12 At CA, we were completely unaware that 13 13 this item that we see here in Exhibit 3? that is, in fact, what had taken place. And arguably, we believed in good faith that it was 14 A. I would believe that to be the case, 14 15 15 still taking place. yes. 16 16 Q. This is a different segment of JPMorgan Had we known back then, as certainly as 17 17 product manager, one of our job functions within 18 A. As far as I can determine from this, 18 the company is to ensure that our brand maintains 19 19 market value. So in this case, the Endeavor brand yes. 20 20 Q. Do you know whether or not JPMorgan carries a very large market value and a very strong 21 21 Chase, in any of its offices, employed E/Net? following. 22 22 A. No, I don't know. And secondly, one of the things that as 23 Q. Now, your attorney has said that you 23 product managers we have to do is make ongoing 24 don't have specific knowledge of damages, and 24 decisions in terms of our marketplace and how to 25 that's going to be the subject of an expert report. 25 deliver to their problems in terms of buy, build, TSG Reporting - Worldwide 877-702-9580 TSG Reporting - Worldwide 877-702-9580 Page 104 Page 105 1 1 Dueckman Dueckman 2 acquire or retire. 2 approximately at least every six months. And then 3 In 2002, 2000 -- 2002, 2003, obviously, 3 generally we try to introduce a new release to our 4 we still believed this was still forthcoming. Had 4 customers every 18 months to two years. 5 we known at that time, we would have immediately 5 What that allows customers to see is a 6 6 launched into a process where we would have complete ROI, return on investment, sorry, that 7 re-examined whether or not one, do we want to stay 7 they make with us in terms of their maintenance 8 in this marketplace, do we want to stay in the 8 payments and their licensing fees. They 9 natural environment, do we want to build it 9 understand, then, that those -- that that money is 10 10 ourselves, do we want to acquire someone, or do we going to a good purpose to allow them to take better advantage of their business. 11 want to buy a new solution? 11 12 12 Because we were without that information And as we've moved forward with the 13 13 from Atlantis, that effort was never launched. And business of Endeavor and change of configuration 14 14 so in good faith, we just continued on, assuming it management, we expect people or partners to be in 15 was going to be coming as per what we felt was part 15 with us and also releasing new products -- or I'm 16 of the partnership. 16 sorry, new features and functions to our customers, 17 17 Q. Is it your contention that Atlantis was under -- since they're going under the CA 18 18 obligated to deliver a Version 3 of its software? Endeavor-brand umbrella in the first place. 19 A. Yes. 19 That didn't happen for a number of 20 20 years. And even though there were a variety of O. Based on what? 21 21 A. One of the credos, shall we say, in the requests for updates, we thought work was 22 22 IT industry is, you produce or die. And at the end progressing. 23 of the day, certainly within CA, we have a 23 Q. Well, is there anything in the contract 24 continuous maintenance cycle where we produce what 24 that you can point me to between Atlantis and CA

25

877-702-9580

25

we call service packs now for our software

TSG Reporting - Worldwide

877-702-9580

that you believe supports the claim that Atlantis

TSG Reporting - Worldwide

Page 106 Page 107 Dueckman 1 Dueckman 1 2 was obligated to create and deliver a Version 3 of 2 From the cessation of its obligation to 3 its software? 3 sell, in its termination in December of 2007 up until that date, did CA continue to sell E/Net to 4 MR. SCHISSEL: Other than what he's 4 5 5 already testified to? its customers? 6 MR. JENSEN: If he can -- if he already 6 A. Yes, absolutely. 7 7 testified to it, he can refer to that Q. And did CA continue to support E/Net for 8 8 its customers? testimony. 9 9 Q. But what is it that you believe supports A. Yes. 10 10 that claim? Q. And even at the point at which CA 11 A. I believe, in the clause where it says 11 announced that it had a replacement product for 12 12 they will support the CA software, that implies E/Net, did it continue at that stage to offer E/Net 13 more than just technically supporting. It also 13 as a product? 14 implies, to a product manager, supporting the 14 A. Yes. 15 business, the strategy, the direction that the 15 Q. Why didn't CA simply cancel the 16 software is going in. 16 agreement at that point in time? Do you know? 17 17 A. I would say timing. Q. Did CA -- withdrawn. 18 Until the termination of the 18 Q. Did CA believe that E/Net, up until the 19 19 termination of its agreement with Atlantis, relationship in December of 2008, did CA continue 20 20 December of '07, was a product that was suitable to to sell or license E/Net to its customers? 21 21 A. No. Per the terms of our agreement, our be used by its customers who needed to, you know, 22 22 operate Endeavor with a natural and predict obligation to sell terminated in December 2007, and 23 for the subsequent year, we were obligated to 23 environment? provide level 1 support. 24 24 MR. SCHISSEL: Object to the form. 25 Q. Point taken. 25 A. We ensured, during that time, that TSG Reporting - Worldwide TSG Reporting - Worldwide 877-702-9580 877-702-9580 Page 108 Page 109 1 1 Dueckman Dueckman between the parties in 2005 concerning the 2 customers were made available -- were made aware of 2 3 both offerings, so both E/Net, as well as the new 3 royalties that were payable? 4 product that we also had available. We were very 4 A. I had heard of it. 5 diligent in ensuring that customers had an 5 Q. But you have no knowledge of whether or 6 opportunity to choose between the two. 6 not that related in any way to CA's decision to Q. Do you know when CA decided that it 7 7 begin looking for a replacement product? 8 would build a replacement product or obtain a 8 9 replacement product? 9 Q. If I can go back a moment, we've talked 10 10 about a JPMorgan Chase situation where you say you A. Yes. 11 11 O. When was that? lost a sale of E/Net because of the failure to 12 12 A. I believe it was end of 2005, beginning provide either a new version or some enhancements 13 13 to the existing versions of E/Net, correct? 14 14 A. They chose not to pursue -- purchase Q. And do you know what the reasons were 15 for CA to obtain a replacement product at that 15 E/Net, that's correct. 16 16 Q. All right. And was CA damaged as a time? 17 17 A. No. I was not -- I was not privy to the result of that? specific discussions around why the decision was 18 18 MR. SCHISSEL: Object to the form. 19 actually made. I was instructed this was the case. 19 A. CA didn't realize the potential revenue. Q. Do you know whether or not it had 20 20 O. From that sale? anything to do with the dispute between Atlantis 21 21 A. Correct. 22 and CA regarding the amount of royalties that were 22 Q. Are you aware of other damage that CA 23 23 due from the licensing of E/Net? had? 24 24 A. Personally, no. A. No. 25 25 MR. JENSEN: Just give me a second. I Q. Were you aware of a dispute that arose TSG Reporting - Worldwide 877-702-9580 TSG Reporting - Worldwide 877-702-9580